

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action dated January 8, 2004, the Examiner objects to the Figs. 1-3 as lacking appropriate descriptive legends. Claims 10 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 10, 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1-3, 5, 11 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,233,452 (Nishino). Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishino. Claims 6, 9, 16, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishino in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,351,271 (Mainwaring et al.). Claims 7, 17 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishino in view of Mainwaring et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,484,196 (Maurille). Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishino in view of Mainwaring et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,266,048 (Carau). Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishino in view of Carau. Claims 15 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishino in view of Maurille.

By the present response, claim 20 has been canceled without disclaimer. Applicants have amended claims 1, 10-13, 16, 21 and 22 to further clarify the invention. Applicants have submitted new claims 23-31 for consideration by the Examiner. Claims 1-19 and 21-31 remain pending in the present application.

Drawings Objections

The drawings have been objected to because the Examiner asserts that the blocks of Figs. 1-3 lack appropriate descriptive legends. Applicants have submitted amended drawings and respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 10 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicants have amended these claims to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 10, 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended these claims to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 5, 11 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nishino. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Nishino discloses an improved wireless processing apparatus that is connectable to an appropriate one of the access points prepared by an Internet provider even under a mobile environment. A terminal and method of operation whereby user of the terminal requests connection to the Internet, the terminal extracts a CS-ID from notification information transmitted from a wireless base station and, then, retrieves its own association table to acquire a telephone number of an access point nearest to the current location. The terminal dials up to the acquired access point to establish an Internet connection. As a result, the terminal is

allowed to download and transmit data to another computer system connected to the Internet.

Regarding claims 1, 11 and 22, Applicants submit that Nishino does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, inter alia, wireless devices being connected to a server where each of the wireless devices has equal access to bulletin board data, where the plurality of wireless devices, forming a family or group, each include a unique identification that are reserved and used to recognize wireless devices belonging to the same group, or a global unit coupled to a gateway for providing the address of a server, where activation of the terminal initiates a request to the server to establish a shared communication session. The Examiner asserts that Nishino discloses wireless devices connected in order to obtain access to a bulletin board system (BBS) data at col. 1, lines 46-50. However, this portion of Nishino merely discloses, as the Examiner has noted, that server machines are interconnected whereby a data transfer or communication on a BBS may be made between the connected computer systems. This is not a plurality of wireless devices having equal access to bulletin board data where the plurality of wireless devices form a family or group, each including a unique ID that are reserved and used to recognize wireless devices belonging to the same group. This portion of Nishino does not disclose or suggest wireless devices having equal access to a bulletin board. The Examiner infers this limitation into the disclosure of Nishino. Further, Nishino does not disclose or suggest anything related to wireless devices forming a family or group and including

an ID to recognize wireless devices belonging to the same group, as recited in the claims of the present application.

The Examiner asserts that Nishino discloses a plurality of wireless devices forming a group by asserting that a BBS server is designed to allow multiple users to connect simultaneously. However, this assertion by the Examiner, multiple users connecting to a BBS simultaneously, does not disclose or suggest a plurality of wireless devices forming a group, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, the Examiner provides no portion of Nishino to support this assertion. Assuming, arguendo, that the Examiner's assertion is correct, simultaneous access does not disclose or suggest anything related to wireless devices forming a group.

Moreover, the Examiner asserts that Nishino discloses a global unit coupled to a gateway for providing the address of a network unit at col. 3, line 63 - col. 4, line 4. However, this portion of Nishino merely discloses the wireless terminal storing associations between a base station ID and the nearest access points of a provider. This is not a global unit coupled to a gateway for providing the address of a server, where activation of the terminal initiates a request to the server to establish a shared communication session. Nishino discloses addresses stored at the wireless terminal. In contrast, the claims of the present application recite a global unit providing the address of a server. Moreover, Nishino does not disclose or suggest anything related to activation of a terminal initiating a request to the server to establish a shared communication session, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Regarding claims 2, 3 and 5, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim. For example, Applicants submit that Nishino does not disclose or suggest a global address server connected to an access point through which wireless devices can obtain an address of a server.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Nishino does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-3, 5, 11 and 22 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishino. Applicants submit that claim 4 is dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. For example, Applicants submit that Nishino does not disclose or suggest at least one of a plurality of wireless devices being connected to a server through a second access point, a second service provider and the Internet.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Nishino does not disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 4 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claims 6, 9, 16, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishino in view of Mainwaring et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Mainwaring et al. discloses an electronic communication system that provides a shared persistent data space to a plurality of clients. The system includes a server and at least two input/display units (IDUs) which clients use to access shared persistent data in the form of group boards. The group boards stored discrete notes in a group database made accessible to all members of the group. In order to allow clients to select a desired group, each IDU includes an input detection space operable to receive user input indicative of a request to access a specific group.

Regarding claims 6 and 9, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that Mainwaring et al. does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Nishino. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, disclose or suggest a bulletin board data being displayed on a wireless device to resemble a physical bulletin board having notes attached thereto, or where when a display is changed to introduce a new note which is received from a service, that is shared with each of the plurality of wireless devices having equal access to the service.

Regarding claim 16, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of this claim of, inter alia, wireless devices containing

the address of a global address server, the wireless devices accessing the global address server to obtain the address of a server in order to connect thereto. As noted previously, Nishino does not disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. Moreover, the disclosure in Mainwaring et al. regarding the sending and receiving of lightweight messages does not disclose or suggest anything related to wireless devices accessing a global address server to obtain the address of a server containing bulletin board data, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Regarding claims 18 and 19, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 16 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest an access point being connected to a server through a service provider connected to the Internet.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that neither Nishino nor Mainwaring et al., taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 6, 9, 16, 18 and 19 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 7, 17 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishino in view of Mainwaring et al. and further in view of Maurille. Applicants have canceled claim 20. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Maurille discloses providing integrated combinations of threaded instant messages, open display bulletin boards, private bulletin boards, threaded e-mail, explicit acknowledgement of messages, and conferencing, whisper and talk modes. The system can be implemented in any internet-based computer network, including Internet, intranets and extranets. The system includes a server application, a client application and a data repository maintained by the server. The server records in the data repository pertinent information regarding all communications between and requests issued by systems users, and handles the communications and requests cooperatively with the client application in accordance with the system mode being exercised.

Applicants assert that claims 7 and 17 are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 16 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding these independent claims. Applicants submit that Maurille does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Nishino and Mainwaring et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest a bulletin board having notes attached thereto where the notes are of different colors and may have indicia indicating their source.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 7 and 17 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishino in view of Mainwaring et al. and further in view of Carau. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Carau discloses an improved computer or PDA with a projected display onto a substantially flat, white surface to create a virtual computer screen display and a projected keyboard onto the substantially flat, white surface and a laser sensor projected over the keyboard and parallel to the substantially flat, white surface to create a virtual keyboard. The virtual display and virtual keyboard permit the computer or PDA to be substantially smaller than typical computers or PDAs, while also permitting a relatively normal size display and keyboard/user input area.

Applicants submit that claim 8 is dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that Carau does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Nishino and Mainwaring et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest a display being changed to introduce a new note, which is typed on a virtual keyboard.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 8 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishino in view of Carau. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and

assert that claim 14 is dependent on independent claim 11 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that Carau does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Nishino. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest new notes being formed by wireless devices using a virtual keyboard.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 14 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claims 15 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishino in view of Maurille. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding claim 21, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of this claim of, inter alia, a terminal with an identifier, the identifier used to indicate that the terminal belongs to a group of terminals validated by a terminals enabling service, or a gateway from the terminal to the communication services, or an access point connected to the gateway through which the terminal is accessed to the communication service, or a configuration tool in the server for managing at least some of configurable controlling functions of a browser from the terminal, wherein IDs are reserved and used by terminals belonging to the

same group, each group of a unique identification of the terminals being recognized in the same server to be used by the terminals of the group. The Examiner asserts that Nishino discloses a terminal with an identifier, a gateway, an access point, and a server at col. 3, lines 43-53, and that a wireless device connected to an access point which is in turn connected to an internet provider inherently implies a gateway through which a server is accessed. However, Nishino merely describes a base station ID from data received from a wireless base station. This is not a terminal with an identifier, the identifier used to indicate that the terminal belongs to a group of terminals, validated by a terminal's enabling service. Nishino does not disclose or suggest a terminal identifier identifying membership to a group of terminals, or a terminals enabling service, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Moreover, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's assertion that the disclosure in Nishino inherently implies a gateway through which a server is accessed. This assertion by the Examiner erroneously assumes that a gateway and an access point are one and the same device. In contrast, the claims of the present application recite a gateway and an access point being two different devices, connected to each other.

The Examiner admits that Nishino does not disclose or suggest a configuration tool, but asserts that Maurille discloses this at col. 2, line 56 - col. 3, line 1. However, this portion of Maurille merely discloses different communication modes such as talk, conferencing, whisper, mail, messaging, etc. This is not a configuration tool in a server for managing at least some of configuration controlling